

**Office Action Clarifications**

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Collado for the helpful and courteous telephonic interviews she conducted with applicant's representatives on March 23, 2006. During the interviews, applicant requested clarifications on the final Office Action having a mailing date of February 3, 2006 from the Examiner. The Examiner asked applicant to submit a written request for providing clarifications on the Office Action, and accordingly, this request is submitted.

**Office Action Summary**

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicated that:

- Claims 5, and 8-10 are pending in the application;
- Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are allowed; and
- Claims 5 and 8-10 are rejected.

Presently, the application includes claims 1-11, and applicant does not see any reference to claim 11 in the Office Action Summary, i.e., whether claim 11 is objected, rejected or allowed. Since the application is not issued, applicant request confirmation in the Office Action Summary that all claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests a corrected Office Action Summary.

**Response to the Amendment**

Applicant notes the Examiner's acknowledgement of an amendment dated December 9, 2005, which included claims 1-11 pending in the application, of which claims 1, 2, 8 and 11 were independent, and of which claims 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 were amended.

**Response to the Arguments**

In the Office Action (page 2), the Examiner states that the Examiner has considered applicant's argument with respect to claim 8 but indicated that such arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kuji et al. (US 6,776,250) in view of Greeson (US 6,565,620). The Examiner, however, did not provide any basis of rejection of claims 5, 9 and 10 as indicated in the Office Action Summary.

Thus, applicant respectfully seeks clarifications from the Examiner with respect to rejection of claims 5, 9 and 10 as indicated in the Office Action Summary. Also, claim 5 depends from the allowed claim 2, therefore, claim 5 should have been allowed because it includes further limitations to the allowed claim 2. Thus, applicant respectfully seeks correct status of claim 5.

Applicant further requests Official Action on claim 11.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action (page 3), the Examiner stated that claims 1-4 and 6-7 are allowed. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of these claims.

**Conclusion**

Based on all of the foregoing, applicant respectfully seeks clarification regarding:

- status of claim 11;
- allowability of claim 5 (which depends from allowed claim 2); and
- basis of rejection of claim 9 and 10.

If the Examiner has any questions about this letter, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephonically contact applicant's undersigned representative to expeditiously resolve prosecution of the application.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William D. Blackman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,397  
(248) 344-4422

Customer No. 21828  
Carrier, Blackman & Associates, P.C.  
24101 Novi Road, Suite 100  
Novi, Michigan 48375  
March 23, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the US Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit 3618, on March 23, 2006, at the number (571) 273-8300.



WDB/fs